

Select Committee on Accountability
June 16th

Matrix - Holistic Approach for determining ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS

- Used in the identification for gifted programs
- Extremely easy to interpret – picture
- Not based on the weakest link or the strongest link
- Transparent - Easy to identify areas of strength and areas for needed improvement
- Provides a “grading scale” - easy to monitor/track successes – how close am I to an “A”
- Awards points for “raising the ceiling, as well as the floor”!
 - Points for commended scores – “College Readiness”
- Extremely easy to add components – i.e. growth index/value added
- Not an attempt to eliminate the AEIS data that is compiled by TEA – that is valuable information that should be accessible to the public.

This is a concept! Excel spreadsheets & 4 function calculator!!!!

1. **Orange Sheet** - 2007 Report Card/Accountability Rating - Hudson Middle School (50% Economically disadvantaged – less than 30 African American)
 - a. Page 1 - Cirled 2 indicators – below 90%
 - i. One student impacted the Science
 - ii. Same student impacted low SES
 - b. Page 3
 - i. Dropout Rate
 - ii. Attendance
 - c. Rating was based on the “weakest link”

MATRIX CONCEPT: White Pages – Hudson Middle School

2. TAKS:
 - a. 5 subgroups per subject tested:
 - i. All
 - ii. African American (N/A for this campus)
 - iii. Hispanic
 - iv. White
 - v. Economically Disadvantaged (Poverty)
 - b. 2nd Column – percent mastery for each applicable subgroup
 - c. Next 5 columns have a point scale 5 points to 1 point
 - i. 5 points – 95% - 99%
 - ii. 4 points – 90% - 94%
 - iii. 3 points – 80% - 89%
 - iv. 2 points – 70% to 79%
 - v. 1 point – 60% to 69%
 - vi. Final Column – Total Points
 - d. Add the points in each column – Sub-Total for TAKS

Select Committee on Accountability
June 16th

3. TAKS – Commended – ALL Students
 - a. Each subject tested
 - i. 5 point system
 1. 70% or higher – 5 points
 2. 30% - 1 point
4. TAKS – Commended – Economically Disadvantaged – Poverty is the challenge, not ethnicity
 - a. Each subject tested
 - i. 5 point system
 1. 50% or higher – 5 points
 2. 10% - 1 point
5. Other
 - a. Dropout Rate
 - i. < 1% - 5 points
 - ii. > 2% = (-) 10 points
 - b. Attendance
 - i. 99% to 96% - 5 points
 - ii. < 85% = (-) 10 points
6. Total for Hudson Middle School = 131 points
 - a. Rating scale – 4 quadrants based on points
 - b. Determining the 4 Quadrants
 - i. Highest possible points for Hudson MS was 160 points (100)
 - ii. Divide 160 by 4 = quadrant ranges
 - iii. Scored 131 points
 - iv. Exemplary
7. **Beige Sheet** - Low Performing High School
 - a. Remains low performing
 - b. In need of STATE ASSISTANCE - focusing state resources on campuses in crisis – creating “best practices” and/or model programs
8. **Light Pink** - District Template
 - a. Page 1 - 3 = Indicators we presently have
 - b. Page 4
 - i. District with all subgroups – possible points 190
 - ii. Example for adding components
 1. Growth Index/Value added Index
 2. Year/Month gain for illustration only

Select Committee on Accountability
June 16th

- c. Page 5 – Title “District Without Sub-groups”
 - i. Pages 5 – 7 are identical to the other district page
 - ii. Page 8
 - 1. 4 Rating Scales
 - a. Less 1 subgroup
 - b. Less 2 subgroups
 - c. Less 3 subgroups
 - d. Less 3 subgroups & No Low SES

- 9. **Bright Pink Sheet** - Possible Rating Scales – **District with All Subgroups**
 - a. 1st Indicator: TAKS = 5 Subjects Tested X 5 subgroups = 25
 - b. 2nd Indicator: Commended (All Students) = 5 subjects X 5 points = 25 Possible Points
 - c. Commended (Economic Disadvantaged) = 5 subjects X 5 points = 25 Possible Points
 - d. Other = 3 additional indicators X 5 Points = 15
 - e. TOTAL Possible Points = 190 / 4 quartiles = 48 points per quartile

- 10. **2nd Dark Band** – “District Less 1 Subgroup”:
 - a. Rating Scales – **District with Less Subgroups**
 - b. TAKS = 5 Subjects Tested; HOWEVER, Less 1 subgroup, less 5 points that could be earned
 - c. Now 5 Subjects X 20 possible points = 100
 - d. Page 2 - Less 2 subgroups – less 10 points (5 X 15) = 75, etc.

- 11. **Blue Sheet – High School Scales**
 - a. Number of tests – 4 (writing is part of the ELA Test)
 - b. Other – Completion Rate/Continuing HS & Attendance

- 12. **Yellow Sheet – Middle School Scales**

- 13. **Green Sheet – Elementary Scales (PK – 5), (PK – 4)**

- 14. **WHITE SHEET:**
 - a. Lists of School Districts/Campuses represented on this Committee
 - b. 2007 Present Accountability System vs the Matrix
 - c. Colored Cells reflect the changes

- 15. **White - Matrices of the campuses listed on the prior sheet.**

Last set of colored pages:
Templates for the campuses!

Select Committee on Accountability
June 16th

Consideration:

- I respectfully recommend that the district/campus improvement plans be dedicated to addressing all indicators that receive 2 points or less on the matrix. This would include TAKS scores AND commended scores!!!! These plans should provide a comprehensive plan with formative and summative evaluation components to address those areas of concern. There are so many mandated requirements for these plans; I feel they have lost their effectiveness. I think it would be a more useful document if the focus remained on the “areas of needed improvement” rather than a mandated a list of topics that must be addressed.
- The district and/or campus accountability rating is not determined by the “weakest link”!
- As previously stated, commended performance is an excellent indicator for college readiness. Adding “this carrot” to the accountability system will give credit to those students/districts that are raising the ceiling, as well as the floor.
- The matrix concept is definitely transparent. One can look at the rating scales and easily determine the strengths and areas of concern. The quartile points can easily be monitored to determine improvement. (i.e. – total district points improved from 90 to 94 – the district is moving in the right direction!!!!)
- The matrix recognizes the diversity in district/campus demographics, quartile points are determined based on a minimum number of students in a sub-group for the campus and/or district. For purposes of these matrices, I used 30 students at the campus level, 50 students for the district (present standard). I estimated on several of the campuses!
- A growth index will truly reflect what children are “learning” in school. We have many campuses that are making tremendous gains with students; however, the present system only gives credit for reaching the goal.
- The matrix is not an attempt to eliminate the AEIS data that is compiled by TEA and made available to the public. This matrix is designed for rating purposes only.
- The matrix supports an accountability “system”. In other words, one views the “whole” system, whether district or campus, rather than focusing on the lowest performing group.